Form C-104 Rev. 10/07

VALUE ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSAL MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

16. 1	Date 07/14/08
Contract ID 080523-403 77 4	Job No. <u>1472020</u>
County Lafayette	Route 24 Original Bid Cost \$100,536.10
Contractor APAC-Missouri, Inc.	By Casey Castrop
Designed By MoDOT	Phone 573-449-0886
VECP# VECPO	VECP or VECP/PDU
	Advanta === /Disa decenta ===
•	ats and proposed change(s). Advantages/Disadvantages
subgrading/shouldering operation. Al	(35,030 gallons) on the existing shoulders after the PAC is proposing to shoot Tack Coat at a rate of 0.10 gal/SY (9220
gallons) in lieu of Prime Coat. The say	yings for this change equal $$100,536.10 - 13,830.00 = $86,706.10$.
There will be no additional change in tremoving the required 24-hour cure p	the paving operation. Use of tack coat will expedite the project by eriod for Prime Coat.
2. Estimate of reduction in constructi	ion costs. \$86,706.10
	sed change(s) will have on other department costs, such as
maintenance and operations.	
None anticipated	
4. Anticipated date for submittal of d	letailed change(s) of items required by Section 104.6 of the
Specifications.	
,	(date)
	(date)
5. Deadline for issuing a change orde	er to obtain maximum cost reduction, noting the effect of contract
completion time or delivery schedu	ıle.
	· ·
August 1, 2008	(00)
(date)	(effect)
6. Dates of any previous or concurren	nt submission of the same proposal.
o. Dates of any previous of concurred	if anymission of the arms by obeser.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	(date and/or dates)
_	

Additional Comments:

** Portion Below This Line To Be Filled Out by MoDOT **

Comments: SEE ATTACHED
Submitted By Resident Engineer Date BRIAN ILES
Comments: — PROJECT OFFICE HAD ALREADY TDENTIFIED AND GOT APPROVAL TO ELIMINATE PRIOR TO THIS SUBMITTAL. Approval Recommended Rejection District Engineer Date
Recommended Comments: APPROAD AS A PRACTICAL DESIGN PROPOSAL AT 75/25,
Approval PueMbers by JSB. 8-4-08 □ Rejection State Construction and Materials Engineer Date

Distribution:

Resident Engineer, Project Manager, District Operations Engineer, State Construction and Materials Engineer *Value Engineering Administrator - *MoDOT, P.O. Box 270, Jefferson City, MO 65102

MEMORANDUM



Missouri Department of Transportation

Construction Richmond Project Office

TO:

Perry Allen-4co

CC:

File

FROM:

Brian K. Iles

Resident Engineer

DATE:

July 21, 2008

SUBJECT:

VE Concept Proposals

Job No. J4P2020 and J4M0202

Contract ID 080523-403

Route 24 and Route P, Lafayette County

Attached are five Construction Value Engineering Concept Proposals for the above referenced projects submitted by APAC-MO. The following are my recommendations for each VECP. Feel Free to contact me with any questions or comments.

VECP No. 1 – J4M0202 (Rte. P)

The contractor proposes eliminating the modified cold milling on the north and south end of this project. The north end of Rte. P ends at railroad tracks. There is a gravel entrance for the railroad to access the tracks. The contract includes crushed stone for this entrance. The south end of Rte. P ends at Rte. 24. The Project Manager, Paul Boenishch, indicated that this project was designed to be let alone and that is why the modified milling was included in the contract at the Rte. 24 intersection. Since the project was let combination with the Rte. 24 overlay, the modified milling is unnecessary. APAC intends to install the Rte. 24 overlay prior to overlaying Rte. P. There will be a 1.75-inch elevation difference between Rte. 24 and Rte. P for approximately two weeks. MoDOT will require the contractor to install a wedge until the Rte. P overlay is connected to Rte. 24.

I recommend approval of this Construction Value Engineering Concept Proposal No. 1.

VECP No. 2 – J4M0202 (Rte. P)

The contractor proposes installing 1.75-inches of BP-1 in lieu of the contract specified 0.5-inch of BP-3 and 1.25-inch of BP-2. Rte. P has significant rutting caused by trucks used to repair the railroad bed after the flooding that occurred the spring of 2007. This contract does not include quantity for irregularities. The BP-3 will overrun significantly to backfill the rutting. If used, the BP-1 would significantly overrun as well, which would negate any savings. This roadway needs a surface leveling before installation of a surface lift. In addition, the BP-3 is a better mix for backfilling the severe irregularities. Therefore, I recommend this proposal be denied.

VECP No. 3 - J4P2020 (Rte. 24)

The contractor proposes eliminating the 3.5-inch BP-1-overlay on the mainline-concrete adjacent-to the Tabo Creek Bridge but still install 3.75-inch, 4-foot wide shoulders. The existing concrete surface is in poor condition. In fact, this stretch will receive nearly 195 pavement repairs as part of this project. On July 10 2008, MoDOT determined to change the overlay thickness on the concrete from 3.50-inches to a minimum thickness of 2.75-inches to avoid encountering steel when conducting modified milling. MoDOT informed the contractor of this in a letter dated July 10, 2008. I recommend this proposal be denied because of the poor condition of the existing concrete.

VECP No. 4 - J4P2020 (Rte. 24)

The contractor proposes using a tack coat in lieu of a prime coat on the existing shoulders. APAC-MO inquired about this item in a phone call on July 14, 2008. There was no mention of value engineering at the time of the phone conversation with the contractor. This office contacted central office for a recommendation on the same day. Central office informed this office that no prime is necessary. MoDOT informed the contractor that the prime was unnecessary in a letter dated July 14, 2008. Therefore, MoDOT did inform the contractor of the underrun prior to this proposal submittal. As result, I recommend the proposal be denied or only be considered as a practical engineering savings (75/25).

VECP No. 5 - J4P2020 (Rte. 24)

MoDOT has requested the contractor submit information about the existing roadway condition before MoDOT will consider the proposal for acceptance. We requested at least one core per mile to adequately indicate the condition of the roadway. The contractor has agreed to do this. My recommendation will be based on the results of the cores.

BRIAN INFORMED ME

THAT CORES DETERMINATED

THAT STRIPPING EXISTS

IN SOB COURSES. THIS

IN SOB COURSES. THIS

PRECLUDES ANY MILLING

UNLESS FULL REMOVAL.

UNLESS FULL REMOVAL.

SINCE THIS IS NOT THE

SCOPE, I RECOMMEND

DENIALOF THIS VECT

NO.5.

PON

VALUE ENGINEERING CHECK SHEET

TYPE OF WORK (Check one that applies) Bridge/Structure/Footings Drainage Structures (RCP, RCB, CMP's, ect.) TCP/MOT X Paving (PCCP, ect.) Grading/MSE Walls Signal/Lighting/ITS Misc.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL (If needed, condense summary to a couple of lines)	
Underrun Prime Coat on existing earth shoulders	

SCANNING OF DOCUMENT
If the proposal is large, please mark or make note, which pages need to be scanned into the database. If there are special instructions, make note of them here.
Scan entire document